



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

sk

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/037,659	01/02/2002	Tanya Couch	SVL920010074US1/2304P	6531
45728	7590	10/03/2007		
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP P.O. BOX 51418 PALO ALTO, CA 94303			EXAMINER BETIT, JACOB F	
			ART UNIT 2164	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 10/03/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent@sawyerlawgroup.com
nikia@sawyerlawgroup.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/037,659

Applicant(s)

COUCH ET AL.

Examiner

Jacob F. Bétit

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-90 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-90 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to the decision of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences dated 30 April 2007, a new rejection is presented below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 10-12, 14-17, 22-24, 26-31, 36-38, 40-43, 48-50, 52-58, 64-65, and 67-90 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drexter (U.S. patent application publication No. 2002/0046248 A1) in view of Leymann et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,122,633).

As to claim 1, Drexter teaches a method for converting messaging data into a relational table format in a database system, wherein the messaging data is within a messaging system (see page 1, paragraph 0002), the method comprising the steps of:

- (a) providing a plurality of table formatting specifications; (see page 2, paragraph 0029);
- (b) utilizing the plurality of table formatting specifications to automatically build a table function (see page 3, paragraph 0034);
- (c) invoking the table function to access the messaging data (see pages 2-3, paragraphs 0030-0033); and

Art Unit: 2164

(d) converting the messaging data by the table function into specific data types according to the plurality of table formatting specifications, wherein the messaging data is transformed into the relational table format (see page 3, paragraph 0033).

Drexter does not distinctly disclose storing a table function in the database system, and invoking the table function from within the database system.

Leymann et al. teaches this, see column 3, lines 43-59; column 10, lines 15-54; column 11, line 50 through column 12 line 9; and column 12, line 58 through column 13, line 7.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Drexter to include the teachings of Leymann et al. because the location of the table function in no way effects the result of what happens when the table function is invoked to convert the message data. Therefore it would be obvious to have the table function be part of the database to produce the same predictable results.

Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the database with the table function because it is commonplace that combination of two things typically used together into a single thing is obvious. See, e.g., *Anderson's-Black Rock, Inc. v. Pavement Salvage Co.*, 396 U.S. 57 (1969); *Richardson-Vicks Inc. v. Upjohn Co.*, 122 F.3d 1476, 44 USPQ2d 1181 (Fed.Cir. 1997).

As to claim 27, Drexter teaches a computer readable medium containing programming instructions for converting messaging data into a relational table format in a database system, wherein the messaging data is within a messaging system (see page 2, paragraph 0024), comprising the programming instructions for:

Art Unit: 2164

- (a) providing a plurality of table formatting specifications (see page 2, paragraph 0029);
- (b) utilizing the plurality of table formatting specifications to automatically build and a table function (see page 3, paragraph 0034);
- (c) invoking the table function to access the messaging data (see pages 2-3, paragraphs 0030-0033); and
- (d) converting the messaging data by the table function into specific data types according to the plurality of table formatting specifications, wherein the messaging data is transformed into the relational table format (see page 3, paragraph 0033).

Drexter does not distinctly disclose storing a table function in the database system, and invoking the table function from within the database system.

Leymann et al. teaches this, see column 3, lines 43-59; column 10, lines 15-54; column 11, line 50 through column 12 line 9; and column 12, line 58 through column 13, line 7. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Drexter to include the teachings of Leymann et al. because the location of the table function in no way effects the result of what happens when the table function is invoked to convert the message data. Therefore it would be obvious to have the table function be part of the database to produce the same predictable results.

Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the database with the table function because it is commonplace that combination of two things typically used together into a single thing is obvious. See, e.g., *Anderson's-Black Rock, Inc. v. Pavement Salvage Co.*, 396 U.S. 57 (1969); *Richardson-Vicks Inc. v. Upjohn Co.*, 122 F.3d 1476, 44 USPQ2d 1181 (Fed.Cir. 1997).

As to claims 2 and 28, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the table function invokes at least one messaging function within the database system (see Drexter, page 4, paragraph 0042).

As to claims 3 and 29, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the table function and the at least one messaging function are user-defined functions within the database system (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0034).

As to claims 4 and 30, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the at least one messaging function retrieves and reads messaging data in the message system (see Drexter, page 4, paragraph 0042).

As to claims 5 and 31, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the step of:

(a1) reading the plurality of table formatting specifications from a file (see Drexter, page 4, paragraph 0041).

As to claims 10 and 36, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the step of:

(a1) providing formatting information about the messaging data (see Drexter, pages 2-3, paragraphs 0030-0033).

As to claims 11 and 37, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a1) further includes the steps of:

(a1i) designating a delimiter character, wherein the delimiter character separates the messaging data into column data (see Drexter, pages 2-3, paragraphs 0030-0031).

As to claims 12 and 38, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the converting step (d) further comprising:

(d1) invoking a parser function within the database system for parsing the delimited messaging data (see Drexter, pages 2-3, paragraphs 0030-0031).

As to claims 14 and 40, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a1) further includes the step of:

(a1i) specifying a fixed-length format by indicating a position (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0036) and length of each column (see Drexter, pages 2-3, paragraph 0030).

As to claims 15 and 41, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the step of:

(a2) allowing a user to view the messaging data in the messaging system to verify the formatting information provided (see Drexter, page 6, paragraph 0064).

As to claims 16 and 42, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the messaging data comprises a message string, the message string including a plurality of substrings, wherein each

Art Unit: 2164

substring represents data that is returned as a column in a table (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0037, where “column” is read on “field”).

As to claims 17 and 43, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the step of:

(a1) defining a column for each substring of the plurality of substrings in the message string (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0036).

As to claims 22 and 48, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the step of:

(a1) allowing a user to create and name a table view based on the table formatting specifications (see Drexter, page 3, paragraphs 0034-0037).

As to claims 23 and 49, as modified, Drexter teaches wherein the invoking step (c) further includes the step of:

(c1) selecting messaging data from the table view (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0036).

As to claims 24 and 50, as modified, Drexter teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the step of:

(a1) allowing a user to review a summary of the table formatting specifications before building the table function (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0035-0036).

As to claims 26 and 52, as modified, Drexter teaches further including populating directly a relational table in the database system with the returned messaging data (see Drexter, figure 1).

As to claim 53, Drexter teaches a system for converting messaging data into a relational table format in a database system, wherein the messaging data is within a messaging system (see Drexter, page 1, paragraph 0002), the system comprising:

a processor (see page 2, paragraph 0023);

a table function building application executable by the processor for receiving a plurality of table formatting specifications (see page 2, paragraph 0029) and for utilizing the plurality of table formatting specifications to automatically build and a table function (see page 3, paragraph 0034, where it is inherent that the associations (functions) are stored if they are going to be retrieved or recalled); and

means for invoking the table function to access the messaging data (see pages 2-3, paragraphs 0030-0033);

wherein, once invoked, the table function converts the messaging data into specific data types according to the plurality of table formatting specifications and transforms the messaging data into the relational table format (see page 3, paragraph 0033).

Drexter does not distinctly disclose storing a table function in the database system, and invoking the table function from within the database system.

Leymann et al. teaches this, see column 3, lines 43-59; column 10, lines 15-54; column 11, line 50 through column 12 line 9; and column 12, line 58 through column 13, line 7.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2164

invention was made to have modified Drexter to include the teachings of Leymann et al. because the location of the table function in no way effects the result of what happens when the table function is invoked to convert the message data. Therefore it would be obvious to have the table function be part of the database to produce the same predictable results.

Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the database with the table function because it is commonplace that combination of two things typically used together into a single thing is obvious. See, e.g., *Anderson's-Black Rock, Inc. v. Pavement Salvage Co.*, 396 U.S. 57 (1969); *Richardson-Vicks Inc. v. Upjohn Co.*, 122 F.3d 1476, 44 USPQ2d 1181 (Fed.Cir. 1997).

As to claim 54, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the table function invokes at least one messaging function within the database system (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0038).

As to claim 55, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the table function and the at least one messaging function are user-defined functions within the database system (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0034).

As to claim 56, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the at least one messaging function retrieves and reads messaging data in the message system (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0038).

As to claim 57, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the table function building application includes a means for collecting the table formatting specifications from a user (see Drexter, page 3, paragraphs 0035-0037).

As to claim 58, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the table function building application includes means for downloading the table formatting specifications from a file (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0034).

As to claim 64, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the table function building application builds the table function based on the plurality of table formatting specifications collected through the graphical user interface (see Drexter, page 3, paragraphs 0035-0037).

As to claim 65, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the invoking means includes means for selecting messaging data from the table view (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0036).

As to claim 67, Drexter as modified, teaches a system for generating a customized invocation mechanism (see Drexter, page 1, paragraph 0002), comprising:

an interface for receiving customizations (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0034-0037);
and

a software module coupled to the interface for building an invocation mechanism based on the customization specifications and storing the invocation mechanism in a database (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0034, where it is inherent that the associations (functions) are stored

Art Unit: 2164

if they are going to be retrieved or recalled), wherein the invocation mechanism is invokable by the database for accessing data external to the database (see Drexter, page 3, paragraphs 0036-0037).

As to claim 75, Drexter teaches a method for generating a customized invocation mechanism (see page 1, paragraph 0002), comprising the steps of:

receiving customization specifications (see Drexter, page 3, paragraphs 0034-0037); and building an invocation mechanism based on the customization specifications (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0034), wherein the invocation mechanism is invokable for accessing data external to the database (see Drexter, page 3, paragraphs 0036-0037).

Drexter does not distinctly disclose storing the invocation mechanism in a database and wherein the invocation mechanism is invokable by the database for accessing data external to the database.

Leymann et al. teaches this, see column 3, lines 43-59; column 10, lines 15-54; column 11, line 50 through column 12 line 9; and column 12, line 58 through column 13, line 7.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Drexter to include the teachings of Leymann et al. because the location of the table function in no way effects the result of what happens when the table function is invoked to convert the message data. Therefore it would be obvious to have the table function be part of the database to produce the same predictable results.

Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the database with the table function because it is commonplace

Art Unit: 2164

that combination of two things typically used together into a single thing is obvious. See, e.g., *Anderson's-Black Rock, Inc. v. Pavement Salvage Co.*, 396 U.S. 57 (1969); *Richardson-Vicks Inc. v. Upjohn Co.*, 122 F.3d 1476, 44 USPQ2d 1181 (Fed.Cir. 1997).

As to claim 83, Drexter teaches a program product containing instructions executable by a computer, the instructions embodying a method for generating a customized invocation mechanism (see page 2, paragraph 0024), comprising the steps of:

receiving customization specifications (see page 3, paragraphs 0034-0037); and
building an invocation mechanism based on the customization specifications (see page 3, paragraph 0034), wherein the invocation mechanism is invokable for accessing data external to the database (see page 3, paragraphs 0036-0037).

Drexter does not distinctly disclose storing the invocation mechanism in a database and wherein the invocation mechanism is invokable by the database for accessing data external to the database.

Leymann et al. teaches this, see column 3, lines 43-59; column 10, lines 15-54; column 11, line 50 through column 12 line 9; and column 12, line 58 through column 13, line 7. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Drexter to include the teachings of Leymann et al. because the location of the table function in no way effects the result of what happens when the table function is invoked to convert the message data. Therefore it would be obvious to have the table function be part of the database to produce the same predictable results.

Art Unit: 2164

Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the database with the table function because it is commonplace that combination of two things typically used together into a single thing is obvious. See, e.g., *Anderson's-Black Rock, Inc. v. Pavement Salvage Co.*, 396 U.S. 57 (1969); *Richardson-Vicks Inc. v. Upjohn Co.*, 122 F.3d 1476, 44 USPQ2d 1181 (Fed.Cir. 1997).

As to claim 68, 76, and 84, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the invocation mechanism is dynamically generated (see page 3, paragraphs 0034-0037)

As to claim 69, 77, and 85, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the invocation mechanism further comprises at least one of the group consisting of: a UDF, a table function, a virtual table, a stored procedure, a trigger, a query statement, and a federated table, and an equivalent of any of the foregoing (see page 3, paragraphs 0034-0037).

As to claim 70, 78, and 86, Drexter as modified, teaches further comprising means for invoking the invocation mechanism from a database (see pages 6-7, paragraphs 0070-0072).

As to claim 71, 79, and 87, Drexter as modified, teaches further comprising means for converting data accessed by the invocation mechanism into a format understood by the database (see page 5, paragraphs 0055-0057).

Art Unit: 2164

As to claim 72, 80, and 88, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the interface further comprising a graphical user interface for receiving function customization specifications (see page 7, paragraphs 0074-0077).

As to claim 73, 81, and 89, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the customization specifications further comprise specification of a relational format for nonrelational data accessed by the customized function (see page 3, paragraphs 0034-0037).

As to claim 74, 82, and 90, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the interface further comprises means for previewing nonrelational data in relational format based on customization specifications (see page 3, paragraph 0034-0037).

4. Claims 6-9, 32-35, and 59-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drexter (U.S. patent application publication No. 2002/0046248 A1) in view of Leymann et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,122,633) as applied to claims 1-5, 10-12, 14-17, 22-24, 26-31, 36-38, 40-43, 48-50, 52-58, 64-65, and 67-90 above, and in further view of Demers et al. (U.S. patent No. 5,870,761).

As to claims 6 and 32, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the steps of:

- (a1) selecting a name for the table function (see page 3, paragraph 0034);
- (a2) specifying where the table function is to be stored (see page 3, paragraph 0034 and see page 4, paragraph 0041).

(a3) indicating where the messaging data resides (see page 3, paragraph 0038).

Drexter does not teach selecting a type for the table function, wherein the type includes one of a retrieve function and a read function.

Demers et al. teaches this (see column 5, lines 4-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Drexter to include the teachings of Demers et al. because these teachings would allow other destination sites to dequeue the record (see Demers et al., column 5, lines 4-12).

As to claims 7 and 33, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the specifying step (a2) further includes the steps of:

(a2i) providing a database name and access information; and (a2ii) allowing the user to validate the access information (see Drexter, page 4, paragraph 0039).

As to claims 8 and 34, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the indicating step (a3) further includes the step of:

(a3i) providing a service point name for the messaging data (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0038).

As to claims 9 and 35, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the indicating step (a3) further includes the step of:

(a3i) providing a system default endpoint for the messaging data (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0037).

As to claim 59, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the collecting means comprises a graphical user interface, wherein the graphical user interface prompts a user to select a name to specify where the table function is to be stored, and to indicate where the messaging data resides (see page 3, paragraph 0034).

Drexter does not teach to select a type for the table function, wherein the type includes one of a retrieve function and a read function.

Demers et al. teaches this (see column 5, lines 4-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Drexter to include the teachings of Demers et al. because these teachings would allow other destination sites to dequeue the record (see Demers et al., column 5, lines 4-12).

As to claim 60, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the graphical user interface further prompts the user to provide formatting information about the messaging data (see Drexter, page 3, paragraphs 0035-0036).

As to claim 61, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the messaging data comprises a message string, the message string including a plurality of substrings, wherein each substring represents data that is returned as a column in a table (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0036).

Art Unit: 2164

As to claim 62, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the graphical user interface further allows the user to define a column for each substring of the plurality of substrings in the message string (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0035-0037).

As to claim 63, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the table function building application builds the table function based on the plurality of table formatting specifications collected through the graphical user interface (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0035-0037).

5. Claims 13 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drexter (U.S. patent application publication No. 2002/0046248 A1) in view of Leymann et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,122,633) as applied to claims 1-5, 10-12, 14-17, 22-24, 26-31, 36-38, 40-43, 48-50, 52-58, 64-65, and 67-90 above, and in further view of Huth et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,704,742 B1).

As to claims 13 and 39, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the invoking step (d1) further includes:

(d1i) checking for the parser function within the database system (see figure 2, reference number 42); and

(d1iii) registering the parser function to the database system after it is built (see page 3, paragraph 0036).

Drexter does not teach

(d1ii) building the parser function if it does not exist within the database system.

Huth et al. this (see column 9, lines 30-58). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Drexter to include the teachings of Huth et al. because these teachings would allow the manipulation of data in a way that was not previously defined (see Huth et al., abstract).

6. Claims 18-21, 25, 44-47, 51, and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Drexter (U.S. patent application publication No. 2002/0046248 A1) in view of Leymann et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,122,633) as applied to claims 1-5, 10-12, 14-17, 22-24, 26-31, 36-38, 40-43, 48-50, 52-58, 64-65, and 67-90 above, and in further view of Poskanzer (U.S. patent No. 6,658,426 B1).

As to claims 18 and 44, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the defining step (a1) further includes the steps of:

(a1i) naming each column (see page 5, paragraph 0056)

Drexter does not teach (a1ii) designating a data type for each column.

Poskanzer teaches this (see column 3, lines 39-43). Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Drexter to include the teachings of Poskanzer because these teachings would determine how the SQL statement must be structured to access data relating to that field (see Poskanzer, column 3, lines 39-43).

As to claims 19 and 45, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the defining step (a1) further includes the step of:

Art Unit: 2164

(a1iii) allowing the user to view the messaging data formatted according to the column definitions provided (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0035).

As to claims 20 and 46, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the providing step (a) further includes the step of:

(a2) building the table function based on the table formatting specifications collected from the user (see Drexter, page 3, paragraph 0035-0037).

As to claims 21 and 47, Drexter as modified, teaches wherein the converting step (c) further includes:

(d1) parsing the message string into the plurality of substrings (see Drexter, page 5, paragraph 0056).

(d2) converting each substring into the designated data type corresponding to its column (see Poskanzer, column 3, line 54 through column 4, line 4).

As to claims 25 and 51, Drexter as modified, does not teach wherein the invoking step (c) further includes the step of:

(c1) integrating the table function within a structured query language statement.

Poskanzer teaches this (see column 3, lines 26-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Drexter to include the teachings of Poskanzer because these teachings would allow it to input data into an SQL database (see Poskanzer, column 3, lines 29-34, and see lines 15-17).

As to claim 66, Drexter as modified, does not teach wherein the invoking means includes means for integrating the table function within a structured query language statement.

Poskanzer teaches this (see column 3, lines 26-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Drexter to include the teachings of Poskanzer because wherein the invoking means includes means for integrating the table function within a structured query language statement would allow it to input data into an SQL database (see Poskanzer, column 3, lines 29-34, and see lines 15-17).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacob F. Bétit whose telephone number is (571) 272-4075. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

jfb
24 Aug 2007


JAMES DWYER, DIRECTOR
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100